

REMARKS

According to the Advisory Action mailed October 19, 2004, claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application, claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are allowed, and claims 2, 4, 6 and 8-14 stand rejected. Specifically, claims 1, 4/1, 5 and 8/5 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller et al. (USP 6,373,074) in view of Endriz (USP 5,594,752) and claims 2, 3, 4/2, 4/3, 6, 7, 8/6, 8/7 and 9-14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller et al. in view of Endriz and Ishiwata (USP 6,157,756).

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 12 and added new claims 15-18.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests favorable disposition of the application.

Argument

Applicant has amended independent claims 2 and 6 to require that “each of the laser diodes are located in an orientation such that a beam spread direction, which is normal to a junction plane, approximately coincides with the direction, along which the laser beams stand in a row.” As argued previously, for example in the Request for Reconsideration filed October 4, 2004, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, claims 2 and 6, and all claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the prior art.

Claims 9 and 12 have been amended to require that “the laser beam is converged only in a plane parallel to a junction plane of the laser diode.” As disclosed at page 38, line 23 through page 39, line 3, “FIG. 6B shows how the intensity of the stimulating rays 10a is distributed along

the main scanning direction indicated by the double headed arrow X on the stimuable phosphor sheet 13 in cases where the laser diode 11a is located in an orientation such that the beam spread direction, which is parallel with the junction plane, coincides with the direction, along which the stimulating rays 10a, 10b, 10c, . . . stand in a row.”

Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of amended claims 9 and 12 and, thus, these claims, and any claims dependent thereon are patentable over the prior art.

Patentability of New Claims

For additional claim coverage merited by the scope of the invention, Applicant has added new claims 15-18. Applicant submits that the prior art does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the combination of features contained therein. For example, none of the prior art references teach or otherwise suggest a cylindrical lens that comprises a single continuous cylindrical surface. Support for the subject matter recited in new claims 15-18 is found in at least Fig. 3, e.g., showing lens 12.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims **1-18**, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned** at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 09/939,659

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Barner
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q65937